

**14549. Misbranding of Whitlock's Specific and Whitlock's U-G-R-G-L. U. S. v. 99 Bottles of Whitlock's Specific and 240 Bottles of Whitlock's U-G-R-G-L. Products released under bond to be relabeled.** (F. & D. Nos. 20529, 20530, 20547, 20458. I. S. Nos. 1370-x, 1371-x, 1387-x, 1388-x. S. Nos. C-4834, C-4851.)

On November 4, 1925, the United States attorney for the Western District of Michigan, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 99 bottles of Whitlock's Specific and 240 bottles of Whitlock's U-G-R-G-L, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Grand Rapids, Mich., alleging that the articles had been shipped by the Cherokee Remedy Co., from Chicago, Ill., on or about October 23, 1925, and transported from the State of Illinois into the State of Michigan, and charging misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act as amended. The articles were labeled in part: (Whitlock's Specific) "No. 2 for Blood Disorders Whitlock's Specific A Liquid Food Makes New Blood Cherokee Remedy Co. Chicago," (Whitlock's U-G-R-G-L) "for the prevention of disease, \* \* \* benefits in stomach troubles and intestinal infection and diseases of the bladder \* \* \* for cuts, wounds, insect bites, skin eruptions and infections of all kinds, such as Diphtheria, Tonsillitis, etc. \* \* \* germs that cause so much trouble can often be destroyed in the mouth, nose and air passages before they enter the stomach or lungs \* \* \* for internal use \* \* \* For indigestion, Bladder Or any intestinal troubles \* \* \* Cuts \* \* \* Insect Bites Skin Eruptions And Infected Wounds \* \* \* Granulated Eye Lids."

Analysis by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department of samples of the articles showed that the Specific consisted of approximately 99 per cent of water with small amounts of alum, sodium benzoate and extract of a tannin containing plant drug, and that the U-G-R-G-L consisted essentially of a dilute solution of sodium carbonate in water, flavored with menthol.

Misbranding of the articles was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that the above quoted statements, regarding their curative and therapeutic effects, were false and fraudulent, since the said articles contained no ingredient or combinations of ingredients capable of producing the effects claimed. It was alleged in the libel that the Whitlock's Specific was further misbranded for the reason that the said statements were false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser, in that they led the purchaser to believe that the article was a liquid food and made new blood, whereas it was not a liquid food and did not make new blood.

On July 9, 1926, J. T. Whitlock, Chicago, Ill., claimant, having petitioned for the return of the property and having undertaken to relabel the products and filed a bond to secure performance of said undertaking, it was ordered by the court that the said products be released to the claimant.

W. M. JARDINE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

**14550. Misbranding of Syrup of Ambrozoin. U. S. v. 12 Dozen Bottles of Syrup of Ambrozoin. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture and destruction.** (F. & D. No. 20457. I. S. No. 167-x. S. No. W-1787.)

On September 23, 1925, the United States attorney for the District of Oregon, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 12 dozen bottles of Syrup of Ambrozoin, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Portland, Oreg., alleging that the article had been shipped by the American Apothecaries Co., from Astoria, N. Y., on or about April 14, 1925, and transported from the State of New York into the State of Oregon, and charging misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act as amended.

Analysis by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department of a sample of the article showed that it consisted essentially of ammonium chloride, sodium bromide, glycerin, sugar, alcohol, and water, with traces of terpin hydrate, an alkaloid, a phenolic compound, and menthol.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that the labels on the bottle and carton containing the said article bore the following statements, regarding its curative and therapeutic effects: (Bottle) "Bronchitis Laryngitis Asthma Whooping Cough Pulmonary Phthisis And Other Respiratory Affections In Which A Mild Sedative Or Expectorant Is Required \* \* \* Allays Cough, Promotes Expectoration, Exerts A soothing Influence